

D 1296

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — DAILY DIGEST

October 7, 1987

those items which would benefit Nicaragua's independent print and broadcast media, private sector and trade union groups, non-governmental service organizations, and the democratic civic opposition.

Page 513716

(7) Metzenbaum Amendment No. 888, to direct the use of funds for Slovenian broadcasts by Voice of America on a daily basis.

Page 513717

(8) Conrad Amendment No. 889, to express the sense of the Congress that the President should enter into negotiations with members of mutual defense alliances with the United States for the purpose of achieving a more equitable distribution of the financial burden of support for such alliances.

Page 513718

(9) Biden Amendment No. 890, to add the Director of the United States Geological Survey and the Secretary of Energy as members of the Task Force on the Global Climate.

Page 513719

(10) Pryor Amendment No. 891, to enhance cooperation between United States Government agencies in the control of illegal international arms transfers, to aid in the identification and apprehension of illegal arms traffickers, and to expedite procedures for reviewing and issuing arms export licenses.

Page 513719

(11) Bingaman-Domenici Amendment No. 892, to provide that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States, may maintain data bases on the Latin American and Caribbean region.

Page 513723

(12) Roth-Dole Amendment No. 893, to insure that due concern for security is reflected in future construction projects planned or underway in any Communist-controlled country, and providing for a report to the Congress by the Secretary of State.

Page 513726

(13) Pressler Amendment No. 896, to express the sense of the Congress that the Department of State should examine purchasing or entering into long-term leases of foreign residential properties needed to house the principal diplomatic officers of the United States and require a report to the Congress regarding the advantages or disadvantages of purchasing or leasing such properties.

Page 513741

(14) Moynihan Amendment No. 898, to express the sense of the Senate that the Department of State, in arranging visits of foreign dignitaries to the Capitol, shall have in mind that ours is a republican institution which by long established practice, and as a matter of principle, conducts its affairs with a minimum of display.

Page 513746

(15) Helms (for Kasten) Amendment No. 899, to provide for a report on policies pursued by other countries in international organizations.

Page 513750

(16) Helms (for Kasten) Amendment No. 900, to express the sense of the Congress that the President should take all such actions necessary to ensure compliance with the hiring freeze rule, including withholding all assessed United States contributions to the United Nations, and denying United States entry visas to Soviet and Soviet-bloc applicants coming to the United States to replace Soviet and Soviet-bloc nationals currently serving in the United Nations Secretariat.

Page 513751

(17) Humphrey Amendment No. 901, to establish within the Department of State the position of Ambassador at Large on Afghanistan who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Page 513753

(18) Pell Amendment No. 902, to provide for a survey of the number of viewers in Europe who watch the daily passive (non-interactive) shows of USA's Worldnet program.

Page 513755

(19) Helms (for Boschwitz) Amendment No. 903, to express the sense of the Congress that the United States should base its policy toward Lebanon on the following principles: (1) preservation of the unity of Lebanon; (2) withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon; (3) recognition of and respect for the territorial integrity of Lebanon; and (4) reassertion of Lebanese sovereignty throughout the nation and recognition that it is the responsibility of the Government of Lebanon for its safekeeping.

Page 513756

(20) Helms Amendment No. 904, to provide that it is not in the national security interests of the United States for the Department of State to declare, and it shall not declare, itself to be a foreign diplomatic mission.

Page 513757

Rejected:

(1) Symms Amendment No. 860, to express the sense of the Senate that the Senate ought not to have consented to the ratification of the Panama Canal Treaties, whereby the Panama Canal was given away and that such treaties are voidable unless and until Panama formally accepts the DeConcini Reservation and should be voided by the President if such acceptance is not forthcoming within six months of the adoption of this section. (By 59 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 308), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Page 513666

(2) Chafee Amendment No. 894, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to waive the con-

S 13726

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 7, 1987

Delaware for 10 minutes, then we will go to my amendment?

Mr. BYRD. That would be fine. I could include that in the request. Yes I do include that in the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONRAD. Again, Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I certainly prefer not to object, but I am in a difficult situation in that I have pledged to announce my vote today. I would like to be able to explain it. I am just inquiring of the floor managers of this bill if there would be a chance to get some time as we proceed. If there is a chance, I will certainly not object. If there is no chance to get time, I will be left with no alternative but to object.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object. Senators have been waiting patiently. The Senator from Rhode Island was here this morning trying to sell up his amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that after the amendments by Mr. ROTH and Mr. CHAFFE have been disposed of Senators may speak on other matters for not to exceed 10 minutes each.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PELL. Reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object. Senator DeCONCINI is on his way over here, and he is interested in the Bahamas amendment. I would imagine when he comes over he may well agree to a time limitation. I wonder if we could not keep the two Roth amendments together.

Mr. ROTH. I will be happy to agree to a time period.

Mr. BYRD. But the objection was to the time limit.

Why do we not proceed with the bill in the hand and not try to get the one in the bush right now, Mr. DeCONCINI is on his way over. He could negotiate with the Senator on the second amendment. Would that be agreeable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection—does the Senator from Delaware object?

Mr. ROTH No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAFFE. Do I understand the agreement that is being proposed is the Senator from Delaware will proceed on his 10-minute amendment and I will proceed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for a period not to exceed 10 minutes, time which will be evenly divided between the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 899

(Purpose: To insure that due concern for security is reflected in future construction projects in Communist-controlled countries)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. Roth), for himself and Mr. DOLE, proposes an amendment numbered 899.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

SEC. 1. That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any provision of law shall be available for undertaking any additional construction activity on any project planned or underway in any Communist-controlled country until 30 days after—

(1) receipt by the Congress of a detailed report submitted by the Secretary of State and approved by the Directors of the Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, and National Security Agency, on any such project. Such report shall include—

(A) an evaluation of all security-related factors which must be and are being considered in the planning and implementation of such project; and

(B) how any existing and potential security-related issues and problems are being addressed in the planning and implementation of such project; and

(2) receipt by the Congress of a certificate made by the President that appropriate and adequate steps have been taken to ensure that the project may proceed without undue risk that American security interests will be compromised thereby.

SEC. 2. Neither the Department of State, nor any other Executive department or agency engaged in negotiations with the government of any Communist-controlled country for the construction of diplomatic or other official facilities in such countries, shall make any binding commitments on behalf of the United States in regard to such projects, or similar projects of such country in the United States, until a report such as is described in Section 1 shall be submitted to the Congress.

EMBASSY CONSTRUCTION IN EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, as I mentioned on the floor of the Senate this morning, when we discuss intelligence matters, it makes little sense to talk of the Soviet Union. Rather, we should talk of the Warsaw Pact nations, because the intelligence services of those countries are thoroughly coordinated with and, on occasions, substitute for the KGB and the GRU.

Consequently, Mr. President, we must expect that whatever efforts were made to compromise the security of our Embassy in Moscow—and we now know that those efforts were legion—have also been made in Eastern Europe. If the KGB was willing to go to such great lengths to plant his-

tening devices in our new Moscow Embassy, we should expect that it was equally firm in instructing its Eastern European surrogates to undertake similar efforts against our facilities in Warsaw Pact countries.

In this context, I must point out that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, in making its report on the security of the United States Embassy in Moscow asserted, "There is no doubt that similar efforts will be made to attack the new Embassy now planned for construction in Eastern Europe. This suggests the real possibility that the United States will be placed in the same position with respect to these Embassies as it is in Moscow." (P. 11, recommendation 5, "Report on security at the United States Embassy in Moscow and other areas of high risk," Sept. 9, 1987.)

Mr. President, I do not believe that the Senate should contemplate such an unnecessary repetition of our disastrous Moscow experience. To prevent such a development, I have sent an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and the Republican leader. This amendment calls for the halting of State Department construction in any Communist-controlled country until 30 days after the Congress has received a report from the Secretary of State including an evaluation of all security-related factors which must be, and are being considered in the planning of such a project and how such problems are being addressed. This report by the Secretary of State must be approved by the Directors of the Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, and National Security Agency.

Similarly, the amendment precludes the State Department, or any other executive agency engaged in negotiations with a Communist-controlled country for the construction of diplomatic facilities in such countries from making any binding commitments on behalf of the United States until a report on the projected agreement, along the lines I have already outlined, has been submitted to the Congress.

Mr. President, this amendment has been designed to cause minimal disruption to the State Department's construction program, while insuring against the repetition of recent sad developments. I ask Members to view this amendment as a sensible, prudent move to assure us security in regions where it is so frequently threatened.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. Roth) in offering this amendment. It is a straightforward piece of legislation, with two basic provisions.

NO CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT SECURITY GUARANTEES

First, it prohibits any further expenditure of funds for construction of diplomatic or official facilities in Communist countries—until the Congress

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

JAN 11 1977

...and a report that appropriate measures have been taken, to insure that such construction that proceed without jeopardizing the security of the facility.

It is obvious—from the debate in the Senate over recent months, and from some of the other amendments being offered to this bill—that there is still great concern about whether the State Department, acting solely on its own, will do everything that needs to be done to insure the security of these projects. I am going to bring this into this amendment a requirement that the report we are prescribing, although submitted by the Secretary of State, would have to be approved as well by the CIA, DIA, and NSA—in other words, to insure that their national security-related responsibilities, experience and concerns are taken into account.

So that is the first provision—dealing with construction projects already decided on, and are planning or construction are underway.

The second provision concerns

The second provision concerns ongoing negotiations with Communist-controlled countries on future construction projects—whether they be our projects in their country or their projects here. Basically, we require that the State Department or whoever is negotiating on behalf of the United States, make no binding commitment until we are certain that appropriate weight has been given to security considerations. Again, we ask for that assurance through a report, which must be submitted prior to making any such commitments.

Let me stress: We do not intend to stop or disrupt ongoing negotiations. Often, pursuit of these negotiations—and the projects being negotiated—serves our national interest including our national security interest. So the negotiations can go forward.

But when it gets to the stage of making firm commitments in these negotiations—when we say, for example, "OK, we'll let you build in location X in Washington, if you'll let us build in location Y in your capital"—when we get to the stage of making those kinds of deals, we want to see a report before the final deal is struck. We want to be sure the deal will not disadvantage us in security terms.

There is growing feeling, I think, in the Senate that there was a pig in the hole for the United States in security terms. An amendment which we should never have made in the first place.

The amendment says: No more Mt. Alto's. Let us think first, before we sign on the dotted line.

THE PRESIDENT.

So, Mr. President, I think this is a clear amendment, which puts security high on the priority list of things to consider in new construction projects in Communist countries. That is how we ought to treat security—and that is why we should adopt this amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mansell). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. FEEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Democratic side, we have had a chance to examine this amendment and think it is a good amendment. I am glad to agree to it and recommend its adoption.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back his time.

Is all time yielded back?

Mr. FEEL. I yield back my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment (No. 383) was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FEEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFFE. Mr. President—
(Disturbance in the gallery.)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

The Senator will suspend. The time will not be used.

Mr. CHAFFE. Mr. President, I have 45 minutes, I believe, on my side, on this amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAFFE. I yield myself 16 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 384

Proposed To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make the continuous residence requirement under the legalization program for spouses and children of United States citizens.

Mr. CHAFFE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Chaffee) for himself, Mr. Fein, Mr. Morrihan, Mr. Frank, Mr. Starnes, Mr. Mikulski, Mr. Chabrowski, Mr. Frank, Mr. Marston, Mr. Frank, Mr. Frank and Mr. Mikulski, propose an amendment numbered 384.

Mr. CHAFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following: A Section 245A (a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

(D) CONJUGAL RESIDENCE NOT REQUIRED FOR SPOUSE AND CHILDREN OF QUALIFIED ALIENS.—(a)(2)(D) (A), (B), and (C)

shall not apply if an alien who is an spouse or child of an individual otherwise qualified for an extension of status under this act.

Mr. CHAFFE. Mr. President, today, together with Senators Paul, Morrihan, Frank, Starnes, Mikulski, Chabrowski, Frank, Marston, Frank, and Mikulski, I am offering an amendment to correct a serious flaw in the new legalization law. The purpose is to take into account the needs of families.

It is to be especially for the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island for his help as a sponsor of this amendment, and for allowing this measure to be considered as an amendment to the State Department bill.

The Immigration Reform and Control Act passed by Congress and signed into law last year was the product of years of debate and negotiation, and much compromise. Many believed that, given the strong feelings on one side of the issue, it would be impossible to write an immigration reform law that would gain enough support to pass Congress.

Thanks to the persistence and leadership of Senator Starnes and others, we beat the odds by passing such a law. In general, I believe it is a good job. I supported the legalization bill in part because it contains tough new provisions to crack down on illegal immigration in the future. I would like to assure my colleagues that I would never support legislation that would open the floodgates to new immigration.

There was another important feature of the legalization bill that compelled me to support it: It treats long-time resident illegal aliens compassionately. The centerpiece of the law, the Amnesty Program, is based on the reality that there are many aliens who have made new lives for themselves in this country, who are already hard working Americans, and who would therefore be granted the benefits of legal residency.

Since the legalization law went into effect, however, many immigrants and people who work with immigrants have noticed a glaring deficiency in the Amnesty Program. In April I held a conference in Rhode Island on the new law. At that meeting a number of social service providers and others, who acted on behalf of the illegal aliens, raised the question: "What is the INS going to do about family members who do not qualify for legalization? Will the new law result in the separation of families?"

At that time I assured them that, in devising the Amnesty Program, Congress did not intend for families to be separated. I advised Rhode Island's concerned about the potential separation of families to wait for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to issue its final regulations, which were supposed to address the problem.